3/3/69

Dear Gary,

I write you in haste while Lil is fixing supper hoping I can get back to other work after eating. Good thing I got so early a start this a.m., or I'd have gotten very little done on the appendices.

I finally heard from Moo. They had then just charged Clay Shaw. Entirely aside from the wisdom and timing or it, and I can easily defend them on both, they have again, it seems to me, gone off half -cocked, again have what seems to be a flaw in their charge. They seem not to have learned from the one they just got whipped over. If they were going to charge him with perjury and I am satisfied he did perjure himself - why the hell didn't they charge him with all of it? For example, in saying he left the ITM "entirely voluntarily". If they had done that, they'd also have put the heat on those who have lied for him, for example, the man who really fired him, Cobb.

Well, the purpose of this is to ask you, if Vince is still there, to ask him to have them understand they really should, on any other perjury charges, move more slowly and have a really solid charge when they do it. I had earlier written Oser about this and probably sent you a copy. They not only have a solid case against Finck, but they reach through Finck where they do not reach through Shaw, right into Washington guts. I also think Finck will not take such a rap for anyone else's sake. More, with the focus on his work, the autopsy, rather than on Shaw, the reaction would be different. Moo indicates they are getting the transcripts but has no idea when. I told him I'd also like to have copies of Frazier and Shaneyfelt. But would duplicate them and we could then all be bird dogs.

Until Lil calls me, let me add a few other things that may strike you and Paul as they do me. First, I should say that even though the papers label what they print as the real transcript, the haste and the editing, if no other things, may render them undefendable. However, in the direct examination of Shaw, there were several things that Dymond did that fascinate me and apparently went unnoted in court. Hew asked "Have you ever worked for the CIA?" Shaw said no, he hadn't. But as with the Warren Commission, the next question was not asked, and that would have been the same question with the addition of indirectly, or through fronts or covers, as with, I think it is Credit Mondiale, as I have in C in N.O. Cross examination should have included his contacts with the FBI and CIA, and they had to exist. Jesse Core told me how they worked with the FBI, and what he said was all perfectly proper. It should have happened that way. But why assume it didn't happen or there was nothing else? It is inevitable that in his position and from his travels Shaw had to be of some CIA relationship. Saying he was not a direct employee, in the context of a question that would have been appropriate for a desk man in Washington or an official spy, by no means answers the question remaining to be asked. Dymond handled the Army part pretty cute, asking Shaw not had he been in military service, but had he ever worked for any other part of the government other tha the Army. Shaw's response was that he had worked for the Army only. Now it is not "working for" the Army to be in the military service, and I have never, ever, heard anyone indicate it is. So, the suggestion here is that he may have had other military connections that were unexplored. I know his initial lawyer used to be ONI in New Orleans and left the case at the beginning....In reading the c and a I got the feeling Alcock was disspirited.

Meanwhile, so there cannot again be the kind of false excuse you were given that I was so p'ed off over Washington I would have nothing to do with helping them, I told him if there were anything I might know or any help that I could offer, he need only ask. As a matter of fact, I had repeated this before they closed their case and begged them to call Humes for just this purpose. Best,

COPY